

THE *Nation*

AMERICA'S LEADING LIBERAL WEEKLY SINCE 1865

VOLUME 161

NEW YORK • SATURDAY • JULY 21, 1945

NUMBER 3

IN THIS ISSUE

THE SHAPE OF THINGS

49

EDITORIALS

Power Politics in the Middle East *by Freda Kirchwey* 52

The Specter of Famine 53

ARTICLES

Negrín's Plan for Spain *by J. Alvarez del Vayo* 54

Can UNRRA Stop Famine? *by John Corson* 57

Ferruccio Patti *by Gaetano Salvemini* 59

Chicago the Beautiful *by Ray Runnion* 61

In the Wind 62

BOOKS AND THE ARTS

Notes by the Way *by Margaret Marshall* 63

Briefer Comment 64

Films *by James Agee* 67

Records *by B. H. Haggin* 67

Editor and Publisher

FREDA KIRCHWEY

Managing Editor

J. KING GORDON

Washington Editor

I. F. STONE

Literary Editor

MARGARET MARSHALL

Associate Editors: KEITH HUTCHISON • MAXWELL S. STEWART

ROBERT BENDINER [On leave with the army]

Editor Political War Section

J. ALVAREZ DEL VAYO

Assistant Editor

J. MITCHELL MORSE

Music Critic

B. H. HAGGIN

Drama Critic

JOSEPH WOOD KRUTCH

Business Manager

HUGO VAN ARX

Advertising Manager

MARY HOWARD ELLISON

Director of Nation Associates

LILLIE SHULTZ

Board of Contributing Editors

NORMAN ANGELL

JONATHAN DANIELS

CAREY MCWILLIAMS

REINHOLD NIEBUHR

The Shape of Things

THE GUNS OF ADMIRAL HALSEY'S THIRD FLEET, striking at the steel heart of Japan, have ushered in a new phase of the Pacific war. The cities of the eastern coast, from Sendai in Honshu to Abashiri on the northern tip of Hokkaido, were raked by naval shellfire which met with no resistance from coastal batteries or enemy aircraft. Particularly devastating were the attacks on the great steel centers of Kamaishi and Muroran, the latter in the land-locked entrance to the strait between Hokkaido and Honshu. The destruction or beaching of six out of the seven train ferries, which plied across this vital strait connecting the mining and steel centers of the north to the war plants on the southern island should have a crippling effect on the Japanese industrial organization. The daring fleet action followed hard on last week's strafing by carrier-based planes and the war's heaviest single day's bombing by fighter-bombers and Liberators from Iwo and Okinawa and B-29s from bases in the Marianas. *

THE FAST CARRIER FORCE PROVIDES THE NAVY with the most mobile striking air arm in the world. Operating from movable bases, the carrier air force has a highly desirable offensive capacity for short-range attack and surprise, and an equally desirable defensive capacity through the great fire-power of the escort ships. Moreover, its bases can be withdrawn when necessary from under the enemy's attack. It is thus admirably suited to what may be its chief new role—darting close in to the Japanese islands to bomb and strafe enemy airfields, harbors, and the small war plants or targets of opportunity which the big land-based bombers are not so well-fitted to handle. Last week's operations gave further proof of what can be done in this fashion. They were provocative in the extreme, but were carried out without drawing serious enemy counter-attacks on the carrier force itself. This suggests an important deterioration in the enemy's air strength. However, Japanese aircraft losses, in the air and on the assembly line, have only recently begun to mount higher than the monthly production rate, and it is too early to assume that the enemy's first-line air strength has fallen dangerously low. General Chennault has a more plausible explanation: the Japanese are shifting aircraft to Manchuria. Such a shift would be of a piece with the shift of ground forces in continental Asia toward the same region—the innermost redoubt of the powerful defensive triangle from which the Japanese will have to meet the major blow of a Red Army offensive when it comes. Like everyone else, the Japanese must suspect that this will be a high-priority item on the agenda of the Big Three.

Published weekly and copyright, 1945, in the U. S. A. by The Nation Associates, Inc., 20 Vesey St., New York 7, N. Y. Entered as second-class matter, December 13, 1879, at the Post Office of New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1879. Washington Editorial Bureau: 318 Kellogg Building.

WHILE STRENGTH IS GATHERED FOR THESE MAIN thrusts toward the Japanese heart, peripheral offensives far from Tokyo are being fought which must seem anything but peripheral to the Allied troops who are doing the fighting. One is killed no deader over Tokyo making headlines than in forgotten New Guinea, where Australian troops are still heavily engaged, with only about half the island cleared of the enemy. Other Australians are doing an excellent job of rewinning the Balikpapan oil fields on Borneo—an operation which may pay fairly quick dividends in the form of shortened supply lines for oil. In Burma, completely out of the news, the enemy is counter-attacking in an effort to establish a defense line covering the approaches to Thailand and Indo-China, but neither he nor the monsoon has been able to halt the advance of the British Fourteenth Army. When the monsoon is over, two months from now, this battle-wise force, two-thirds of which is Indian, will be joined by the new Twelfth Army in operations which, though perhaps peripheral, are essential to the successful conclusion of the war against Japan.

✱

THE MOST EXCITING NEWS FROM WASHINGTON last week was the absence of excitement at the Senate hearings on the United Nations charter. This was the event that summoned memories of the great betrayal of twenty-five years ago. Last week, the astonishing thing was the absence of any substantial opposition. The opponents represented a handful of dissenters and commanded no important following. Those who testified in favor of the Charter spoke for millions in all parts of the country. One or two Senators asked a few questions; there were no indications that there would be any serious Senatorial dissent when it comes up for vote some time next week. Even the question of the powers of the American representative on the security council, which was raised last week, is not likely to lead to any serious debate. This unanimity throughout the country and in the Senate is something more than a spontaneous change of heart since the bitter days of the isolationist rampage before Pearl Harbor. The war, of course, has had a lot to do with hoisting sky-high the isolationist delusion. But of even greater importance has been the solid educational work carried on by all kinds of organizations interested in assuring America's participation, fully and without reservation, in the world organization. The State Department's campaign to inform people of the meaning of Dumbarton Oaks also had its effect. Perhaps most important of all was the decision of President Roosevelt and Secretary Hull to call on the Republican Party leadership to assume active responsibility in the sponsorship of the charter. The solid Republican bloc which kept America out of the first League shows no signs of materializing, chiefly because Senator Vandenberg, a bitter critic of the Roosevelt Administration, has been converted into a sincere advocate of the Charter. It has taken twenty-five years and a second world war, but out of time and trial the nation has learned some world geography and a little political wisdom into the bargain.

✱

BEFORE PRESIDENT TRUMAN ARRIVED IN BERLIN important steps were taken to create an atmosphere conducive to friendly and frank discussion. The tangle that had

developed over the joint administration of the giant waste city was resolved by giving supreme authority over the four zones of occupation to a Kommandatur made up of representatives of the four main powers. Already there have been adjustments to lessen the discrepancies between the policies of the Soviet Union and those of the Western Allies. If within Berlin the four powers can arrive at a workable common policy, then the capital may turn out to be a school for inter-Allied cooperation in Germany as a whole. The larger zones of occupation can no more be isolated from one another than the zones within Berlin's limits. Even now it has been found economically necessary to link Berlin—an island in the Russian zone—to the American and British areas, since the Russian zone is incapable of producing sufficient food. And if reason demands the working out of a common economic policy, so also a common political policy must be devised. At the moment, ironically enough, it is the Russians who are encouraging free political discussion and organization, while American AMG officers, for whatever reason, appear intent on preserving a political vacuum. The Eisenhower-Montgomery order easing the non-fraternization ban should do something to bring together Russian and Anglo-American practice, but obviously the larger question of a common Allied policy must be placed high in the agenda of the Postdam conference.

✱

ONE PROBLEM FOR WHICH THE BIG THREE MUST find at least a provisional solution is the future of the Germans now living in the Sudetenland and in the territories claimed by Poland. Both the Polish and Czech governments have begun to deal with this matter unilaterally by deportations, and both have announced a policy of ridding these regions of all Germans. So far as Poland is concerned, its western boundaries have yet to be fixed by the peace conference, which must also decide the fate of the inhabitants of any lands assigned to Poland. The position of the Sudetenland is different since this is territory stolen from Czechoslovakia which has been recovered. Yet in this case, too, the disposition of the German population cannot be regarded as purely a Czech problem. Thrusting some ten million landless, propertyless Germans from these two areas into the diminished Reich will enormously increase the difficulty of contriving any solution for the economic problems of that country—a matter of concern for all the United Nations and particularly for those with the responsibility of occupying and administering Germany. Moreover, such wholesale transfers of populations will mean an immediate, if not permanent, loss of production, increasing the strain on the resources of the rest of the world. Until Poles and Czechs can be found to take the place of the expelled Germans, fields will go untilled, coal unmined, and factories unproductive. According to reports, the provisional Polish government is planning to move some two and one-half million Poles into areas which have supported more than six million. It is doubtful whether even this quota can be filled by voluntary methods. Peasants do not move readily. There is hopeful talk of the "re-immigration of Poles from abroad," but how many of the millions in America, for instance, are likely to be attracted by offers of land in Pomerania?

IN ANNOUNCING THE BREAKDOWN OF THE Simla Conference, the Viceroy of India, Lord Wavell, asked that there be no recriminations. "The responsibility for the failure," he said, "is mine. The main idea underlying the conference was mine and I cannot place the blame for its failure on any of the parties." This was a wise and tactful statement, but actually the main cause of the deadlock was the intransigence of the Moslem League and its leader, Mohammed Ali Jinnah. Lord Wavell's proposals for the reconstruction of the Indian government on representative lines, as a first step toward the renewal of constitutional discussions, provided that "caste Hindus" and Moslems should each have one-third of the places, with the remainder divided among the Untouchables, the Sikhs, and other minor communities. This plan was more than fair to the Moslems, but Jinnah was not prepared to cooperate unless only Moslems nominated by the League were appointed to the Cabinet. The All-India Congress, which has a Moslem president and claims a large Moslem membership, obviously could not accept this condition; nor could the Viceroy, on whose prerogative it encroached. Mr. Jinnah justified his stand on the ground that he represented 90 per cent of the Moslems. Most observers believe this claim to be very inflated, but it needs to be tested. The best method would be to hold new elections for the provincial assemblies, which have mostly been in a state of suspended animation since 1939. The Simla Conference has, at least, reestablished relations between the Congress leaders and the Viceroy, who seems to have convinced everyone of his sincere anxiety to forward Indian aspirations for self-government. A small flame of good-will has been lit; it would burn more strongly if the remaining political prisoners were released. But above all, some new initiative is needed to lift India out of the sterile morass of communal squabbles.

✱

THE VETERAN-VERSUS-LABOR SITUATION IS serious enough without John Rankin maliciously stirring it up with a bill to exempt veterans from the necessity of joining a union in an organized plant. The bill is ostensibly designed to insure the veteran a job; actually it is intended to smash unions and lower the bargaining power of all workers, including veterans. For if the bill that Rankin sneaked through the House Veterans' Committee when most of its members were absent ever became law it would only invite the use of returning veterans as strike-breakers. And after strike and union were broken, what would become of the rights of the veteran as a worker in industry? As the June 15 bulletin of the American Veterans' Committee puts it, with reference to similar legislation proposed in California: "What [the veterans] probably would receive, in return for the privilege of not having to join a union, is a return to the good old days of lowered wages, worsened working conditions, wildcat strikes, violence on the picket lines, jurisdictional disputes between competing unions, and cheap scab labor driving them off their jobs." The belated "minority" protest of the majority of the committee members should have some effect in making the House hesitate before jamming through a measure so packed with dynamite. It is utterly characteristic of Rankin that he drafted his bill in spite of a report issued by former Veterans Administrator

Frank T. Hines, which stated that such legislation was quite unnecessary to guarantee veterans a job. This report came out of a nine-man committee made up of representatives of the National Association of Manufacturers, the United States Chamber of Commerce, the Department of Commerce, the A. F. of L., the C. I. O., the Railroad Brotherhoods, and three veterans' associations, including the American Legion.

✱

MILLIONS OF NEW YORKERS WHO HAVE BEEN deprived of their daily papers for more than two weeks by a strike of newspaper deliverymen may well cry "a plague on both your houses." They are the victims of a collision between a tough and unreasonable union and a tough bunch of employers anxious to seize an opportunity to "put the workers in their place." The men's organization—the independent Newspaper and Mail Deliverers' Union—has adopted a foolish strategy by defying the War Labor Board. It claims, however, that the nub of its dispute with the publishers—a demand for a 3 per cent payroll levy for a welfare fund—cannot be acted upon by the WLB, whose policy is not to order such clauses in contracts, though it will approve them if freely negotiated. The publishers, well aware of this fact, have insisted nevertheless that the issue must be certified to the WLB. If they had really wanted to avoid the strike they might have offered to arbitrate this point. They have preferred, however, to settle comfortably into a pill-box behind the WLB, whence they broadcast unctuous statements about the wickedness of the union in disobeying government orders. They forget how much they themselves (the *New York Post* excepted) have done to undermine the authority of the WLB when it has cracked down on recalcitrant employers. Remember how they hailed the heroism of Sewell Avery! Now having got a ruling from the WLB that the old closed-shop contract with the union is null and void, the publishers are threatening all the men with dismissal. Just how they are going to recruit replacements is not quite clear; 1,700 strike-breakers are not easy to come by in these days. Perhaps the publishers will be content to sit tight, hoping the union will weaken when its funds run low. They know that the paper they are now accumulating can be used to sell extra advertising later on, while what they are losing in revenue they are saving in taxation. They do not have to depend on "virtue" for their rewards.

✱

ON JULY 16, 1945, THE NEW YORK TIMES revealed in a special dispatch from Rome that on November 28, 1938, a distinguished Jewish author and publisher, Angelo Fortunato Formiggini, had committed suicide by leaping from the campanile of Torre Ghirlandina in Modena, but because he was an anti-Fascist Jew "not a word about it ever appeared in the papers." The *Times* is to be congratulated on catching up on the meaning of fascism, for on January 28, 1939, a letter in *The Nation* told of Formiggini's tragic death. It concluded: "His death was a protest against the senseless brutality of racial persecution. But no newspaper dared to print the news of his death, for the names of Jews, even in obituary notices, must no longer contaminate the columns of the Fascist press. (Signed) Michele Cantarello, Max Salvadore."

Power Politics in the Middle East

BY FRED KIRCHWEY

AN attempt to explain the conflict in the Middle East in simple terms of Gaullist intransigence or British ambition is worse than useless. No situation today is more complex; none illustrates better the multiform tensions between the powers and the obstacles that block understanding.

The British, having taken over the enforcement of "order" in the Levant, stolidly maintain that the dispute is a local one between the French and the Levantine republics. This is manifestly untrue. First, the world knows the record of British intervention from the period of Lawrence and his Arab raiders down to the present. French-British rivalry forms the big-power background to all the unrest in the Levant and conditions every statement made by any official of either country. Less well known are the economic roots of that rivalry. Some day, I hope in these pages, the full story of commercial intrigue in the Middle East, centering largely around oil, will be told in all its lurid detail. It is a story that involves the United States and explains our government's consistent indorsement of Britain's acts in Syria and Lebanon in 1943 and today. The source material for the story is buried in company reports and State Department and Foreign Office files, but when it has been dug out it will be far more enlightening than the public pronouncements of heads of states.

The French, outraged at Britain's bland assumption of "impartiality," maintain that the dispute is not essentially between them and the local authorities at all. They had, they insist, practically restored order when the British intervened, and since then the British have conspicuously failed to prevent widespread brutal attacks on isolated outposts, on French civilians, on disarmed French troops. They reiterate their charge—flatly denied by Churchill—that the British themselves supplied arms to Syrian rioters and that British agents are still busy stirring up trouble. They point out that French troops charged with attacks on Syrians are, in almost every instance, Syrians belonging to the *troupes spéciales*. Very well; one may accept the French case or dispute it, but even if every accusation against the British were substantiated, there remains the fact of native unrest put down forcibly by French arms. It is true that the French had voluntarily acknowledged Syrian and Lebanese independence and were trying to negotiate treaties which would protect their special interests, as Britain has done in Iraq and Egypt. But suspicion of French intentions remained. The politicians of Damascus needed no instigation by foreign agents; they seized upon the first plausible pretext to proclaim their grievances, refuse further negotiations with the French, and rally the British, who were not reluctant.

Behind all this local activity stands the rather ambiguous silhouette of the new Arab federation. This league of Moslem nations may have been a British invention, but it is rapidly developing a character of its own. For while it may be true, as old Middle East hands insist, that the Arab

states can never carry out a unified positive policy, it is equally true that the league is adept at showing publicly a single face to the West. And its leaders are masters of the art of expediency, capable of welcoming British intervention in Syria and Lebanon while preparing to knife the British in Palestine and Egypt. Only the other day the Paris press carried a London dispatch describing the spread of tension from Syria into Palestine, where both Jews and Arabs were said to be armed, and pointing out that only a "strong British force" could guarantee order there. One can imagine the reaction to this report of Arab leaders primed with pious British pronouncements in favor of Arab independence—in areas of French influence!

British-French rivalry and Arab nationalism are the main ingredients of the struggle for power that has, momentarily, centered in Syria. They are not the only ones. Less visible but never to be ignored is the growing influence of Russia. Its interest in the Middle East is far more immediate than that of the United States. Russia has made demands on Turkey for a more favorable position in the Dardanelles. Russia has demanded a hand in Tangier. Russia is interested in oil, like the other powers. Indeed, Russia's firm determination to share in the future control of the Mediterranean basin can no longer be questioned. Toward the Syrian dispute Moscow has so far taken a reserved attitude. It insists on the independence of the Levant states but is not willing to see French influence supplanted by British. It may be assumed, however, that Russia will take a hand in any settlement that goes beyond the immediate, local issues.

Today the newspapers hopefully assume that a settlement is near. The French, with what grace they could muster, announced last week that within forty-five days they would turn over to Syria and Lebanon the special forces recruited in those countries. Direct negotiations with the British and the two Levantine republics have been under way for some days in an attempt to settle the outstanding immediate issues. But it would be a mistake to assume that any fundamental solutions have been found. What all this adds up to, of course, is surrender by the French of their cherished position in the Levant. They have backed out because they had not the power to remain; they have yielded to major force. And they will not forget. Undoubtedly they will do their best to retrieve what they can of their commercial and cultural investment in Syria and Lebanon. The atmosphere that surrounds their retirement is one of resentment, however it may be described in the cables. The underlying rivalries, the conflicts of interest that lie at the back of the whole dispute, remain untouched. A breach has been opened between the two leading European democracies just when unity is most needed.

There is only one possible way of salvaging the situation—the way proposed by De Gaulle and refused by Churchill and Truman more than a month ago. No matter what local agreements may be made, the larger problem of the Middle East should be taken up at a general conference of the interested powers, including Russia and the United States.

For the issues involved are neither merely local, as the British have tried to persuade us, nor merely between Britain and France, as the French sometimes claim. The issues reach out to the edges of the Arab world and beyond.

They interest all the major nations of Europe, and the United States as well. In their solution will be found the fate of the Jews of Palestine as well as of the Christians in Lebanon. The security of a critical strategic area is at stake, with decisions to be reached regarding bases and the presence of Western armed forces. It is easy to talk about withdrawing the French army from the Levant; is Britain prepared to leave the policing of the whole Middle East to the local Arab governments? This question will have to be answered very quickly now that France has made its applauded gesture of conciliation.

Under whatever guise it operates, Western colonialism in the Eastern Mediterranean is a poor expedient. But its faults will not be cured by shoving one power out of control and installing another in its place. The British say they do not want to do this in the Levant. Perhaps not, but in effect they have already done it. And in the process they have precipitated the whole question of mandates and special treaty rights so carefully avoided at San Francisco. Only a conference called for the specific purpose can effectively deal with this question, and it is such a conference the French have demanded. It should not be postponed much longer, for certainly the conflict in the Middle East is one problem that cannot be dealt with at Potsdam. For France is not represented there.

The Specter of Famine

CLINTON P. ANDERSON, the new Secretary of Agriculture, has told us with admirable candor that the food situation is bad, that there is little hope of its early improvement, and that it may easily take a turn for the worse. The present most serious domestic worry is the corn crop, which threatens to be the smallest since 1941 and well below the demand. Shortage of corn means a smaller production of meat, milk, butter, and eggs. It means also increased pressure on other cereal crops and the diversion of wheat to stock-feeding. But wheat is the one primary food which we are able to supply to Europe in quantities which have some relation to needs. If wheat shipments to the liberated countries had to be curtailed, it might prove impossible to avert widespread famine.

Already Herbert H. Lehman, director general of UNRRA, has prophesied "catastrophe" in Europe next winter unless there are greater sacrifices by those of the United Nations which are comparatively well supplied. Recently UNRRA has been forced to make drastic downward revisions in its delivery schedules. Yugoslavia, which has been receiving food relief at an average rate of 41,000 tons monthly, is to be reduced shortly to 15,000 tons. Its estimated minimum needs are 90,000 tons. Louis Swenson, coordinator of procurement for UNRRA, has stated recently that practically no fats or oils, "the foods that starving people most crave," have yet been sent to Europe. Brazil had promised 10,000 tons of cotton-seed oil, but local demand has been heavy and export permits have not been granted. Meanwhile the United States has canceled a commitment to supply 200,000,000 pounds of canned and fat pork after furnishing only 14,000,000.

Mr. Anderson, in the speech already referred to, said correctly that "America cannot feed the whole world." He added, however, that we must do whatever we can, not only for Europe's sake but for our own. The peaceful resettlement of Europe is very much an American interest, and it will prove a tough enough task unattended by famine and pestilence. If Americans could see for themselves the conditions in many parts of Europe they might understand how incomparably better off they are and be prepared to accept shorter rations of some commodities. As it is, too many of us grumble because we cannot get our accustomed foods in the accustomed quantities and express resentment that any scarce goods are shipped abroad at all. We hope that President Truman, who undoubtedly will spend much of his time in Berlin discussing food problems, will report faithfully to the nation when he returns and dramatize the necessity of affording more aid even if it means tightening our own belts a little.

This problem has not taken the world by surprise. In 1943 the conference of the United Nations which launched UNRRA foresaw the urgent need of relief when the war ended and proposed to meet it by a new form of international collaboration. The results have been extremely disappointing, and UNRRA itself is being made the whipping boy. But as John Corson shows in an article on another page, the organization has been hamstrung by the military authorities, on whom it was dependent for supplies and shipping space, and constantly hindered by the political maneuverings of the big powers and the political fears of the small.

One of its greatest handicaps is that it has not been afforded the means to carry out rehabilitation, which, properly organized, could do much to scale down the size of its relief job. Nothing can be done now about the current European harvest, which is much below normal, but if the danger of famine is not to continue into the winter of 1946-7, more help must be given to Europeans to help themselves. That means larger shipments of seed, fertilizer, tools, and, above all, transport facilities, since it is no use having food on the farms if it cannot be transported to the cities. Beyond this, steps should be taken to increase the supply of staple consumers' goods in Europe by making available more raw materials and machinery. Farmers must be given a greater incentive to produce; if the money they get for their crops cannot be used to buy clothing, household equipment, and other necessities, they are not likely to exert themselves to raise output. Food is Europe's most immediate need, but its supply cannot be fenced off from other problems. Relief, rehabilitation, and reconstruction must march hand in hand.

We apologize to our readers for an unfortunate error in an editorial two weeks ago when it was stated that Mr. Grew was "wholly without European experience." It is true that Mr. Grew was out of direct touch with Europe during the momentous days when Hitler was building and expanding the Third Reich, the days of appeasement, the days leading up to and away from Munich. From 1932 to 1941 Mr. Grew was in Tokyo. But before that Mr. Grew had served in Turkey, Switzerland, Denmark, France, Austria, and other countries—in fact, had had rather a wide European experience.

Negrin's Plan for Spain

BY J. ALVAREZ DEL VAYO

Mexico City, July 15

THE arrival of Negrín in Mexico brings to a sharp issue one of the chief political problems left unsettled by the war—the problem of replacing the fascist Spanish regime with a democratic regime entitled to admission into the United Nations. News from inside Spain and the Big Three meeting, at which, according to reliable reports, Spain is to be discussed, have intensified public interest in the conversations beginning here this week with a view to reaching an agreement among the Republicans. These talks coincide with frantic attempts on the part of Spanish fascism to delay its collapse by a change of façade. Ministers like Arrese, secretary of the Falange, who in Hitler's time enjoyed the special favor of the Führer, have been removed in order to create a Cabinet free of notorious Falangists. Should it prove necessary, the Falange itself will be dissolved. Everything possible will be attempted to provide that section of Allied diplomacy which is hostile to the Republic with "proof" that a "new regime" has come to power in Spain and, consequently, that the San Francisco resolution is no longer valid.

All these facts taken together furnish an incentive for Republicans to overcome their differences. The desire for unity overshadows every other consideration. And the man who appears to the mass of refugees best fitted to bring them together automatically becomes their leader. For the great majority here, that man is Negrín. This explains why, had he chosen to reveal the hour of his arrival in Mexico, an immense public demonstration of welcome would have taken place. A similar ovation would have greeted him had he been willing to address a public meeting. But Negrín wanted no reception. He was determined to arrive quietly, just as he had arrived in San Francisco and in Washington. He left the plane at Monterrey and continued to Mexico City by car. It was a disappointment to the great mass of Spaniards, but they have found a certain compensation in discussing in packed coffee-houses what Negrín plans to do.

The first thing he will do is visit President Avila Camacho. After that he will preside at a meeting of the Cabinet with all those members now in Mexico, several of whom will later participate in a meeting of the executive of the Socialist Party, of which Negrín and I are members. Then he will begin negotiations with the different groups.

I am now in a position to reveal for the first time Dr. Negrín's plan for Spain, about which so much speculation has been going on since he left England in January to go to France.

Until a few months ago Dr. Negrín had consistently opposed any change in the government which, under his leadership, had conducted the war and which had continued, even after the defeat, to regard itself as the legal government of Spain. He had no objection to replacing one or two

ministers who for various reasons had voluntarily resigned their Cabinet posts when the government left Spain. But he believed that a complete change of government in exile would be extremely dangerous. And this for the following reasons:

1. The controlling influence of public opinion, essential to the effective functioning of every truly democratic regime, was necessarily lacking after the government was forced to abandon national territory.

2. Even if a new government could have been created in strict conformity with the constitution, it would have required extraordinary precautions to prevent a situation in which the executive—the most delicate arm of government in a parliamentary system—could exercise arbitrary powers which would weaken and discredit republican institutions.

3. Once the government that left Spain had been altered, there would have been no guaranty that new crises would not arise, producing a succession of governments during the period of exile. This, obviously, would have damaged the Republic's prestige and weakened its authority.

4. Even if the personal animosities and differences produced during the period of exile were overcome, they had already created an atmosphere which would make the solution of pressing political problems extremely difficult. No government created under these conditions could have counted upon the united support of the parties and organizations, all of which have been subdivided into contending factions.

5. The authority of Parliament has suffered during the past few years as the result of attempts by some of the Republican leaders to use it in their factional maneuvers.

6. Any general change in the government would have meant a corresponding dilution of responsibility. It has been one of the chief contentions of Dr. Negrín that, no matter how long the period of exile lasted, the legal government had an obligation to give an accounting to the Spanish people and submit itself to their judgment.

7. Not only would responsibility have been diluted, but, even worse, differences of conduct among the individual leaders would have been blurred. It is most important for the future of the Republic that every leader be held to strict account for his own behavior; a change of government would tend to put everyone on the same basis.

8. No government re-created in exile could enjoy the *formal authority* of the government formed in Spain in 1937, which received a unanimous vote of confidence from Parliament shortly before it was forced to abandon national territory in January, 1939. Parliament, moreover, on that occasion—the historic meeting at Figueras—ordered the government to continue its mission even if it had to leave Spain. Nor could any regime set up in exile claim the *moral authority* of the "Government of Resistance" which fought

until the last possible day in Spain; and when forced to leave, continued abroad the same policy it had followed during the war with the approval of the people, Parliament, and the President of the Republic.

For all these reasons Dr. Negrín was opposed to changing the government while it continued in exile. He still maintains this point of view. But he is enough of a realist to recognize that the campaign carried on against the government during these years by certain factions of the political parties and by certain individuals has reduced its capacity to act effectively, especially on international matters. Because of these dissensions he has been forced to limit his functions as Prime Minister, speaking only on those occasions when he felt morally obliged to do so. Obviously this situation cannot be allowed to continue now that the Spanish issue has come to the point of imminent decision. Dr. Negrín has therefore reluctantly agreed to the necessity of changing the government without further delay. A regime must be organized which can command the unequivocal support of the majority of Spanish Republicans in order to direct the fight inside Spain and to promote the cause of the Republic outside.

The first thing to be done is to fill the vacant post of the Presidency of the Republic. For until there is a Chief of State to whom the Prime Minister can offer his resignation, the change cannot be made constitutionally. Señor Azaña's resignation in February, 1939, left Spain without a President. Señor Martínez Barrio, who, as president of the Cortes, would have succeeded Azaña until the next presidential election, refused to do so. The government, which had moved to Madrid in order to continue the resistance in the Central Zone, invited Señor Martínez Barrio, then in Paris, to come to the capital. He imposed certain conditions, which the government accepted. But he remained in Paris. In the meantime Casado's Madrid putsch occurred, organized by British and French agents in the very spirit of Munich capitulation. The government was obliged to leave the country, but as soon as it arrived in France, Dr. Negrín again requested Martínez Barrio to become Provisional President. He again declined. A few weeks later he resigned as president of the Cortes, turning over his functions to one of the vice-presidents. Therefore, the first step that must now be taken in Mexico is to name a Provisional President of the Republic.

The republican constitution provides the means for doing this. According to its by-laws a quorum of a hundred members is required for the election of a president of the Chamber of Deputies, who then automatically becomes the Provisional President of the Republic. When Dr. Negrín is asked, in conversations here, who he thinks should be elected, he always answers that it is up to Parliament to decide; but personally he thinks that the best solution, under existing circumstances, would be to instal Señor Martínez Barrio in his former post. The process of changing the government is already complicated enough without introducing the problem of finding a new president of the Cortes.

The one thing on which Dr. Negrín insists is that the change be made constitutionally—not through excessive legalism but because he is convinced that adherence to the republican constitution will strengthen the government's position

at home and abroad. Take, for example, the question of extra-territoriality. Legally the Cortes can exercise its functions only in a place where it possesses sovereignty. Extra-territorial rights, even when they have not been established through legal codes or treaties, have frequently been granted by many countries. The most recent example is that of Great Britain, where all the governments and parliaments in exile set up in London during the war exercised sovereign rights in their official premises.

In the case of Spain several solutions could be applied. Mexico, which has refused recognition to the Franco regime, could authorize the use of the former Spanish embassy for the meeting of the Cortes; or it might declare any other place where the Cortes convened Spanish territory for the duration of the session. There is even the possibility that the deputies may come together on a ship flying the Spanish flag and anchored beyond the five-mile limit.

Once the Provisional President of the Republic is elected, the political crisis can be resolved by constitutional means. Should Dr. Negrín be confirmed in the post of Prime Minister, he would, in line with his policy of Republican unity, attempt to form the broadest possible coalition government. Only those Republican groups would be excluded which excluded themselves. Dr. Negrín would want the representation in such a government of all parties, trade-union organizations, and even their various subdivisions formed during the period of exile. He would also urge the participation of outstanding national leaders. Only men who prepared or aided the rebellion would be left out. This automatically excludes Gil Robles, leader of the ultra-reactionary clerical party, Acción Popular, who was involved in the revolt of July, 1936, although he early broke with Franco and took refuge in Portugal. It also excludes Colonel Casado, author of the 1939 coup—which was no less an act of rebellion than the Franco uprising itself.

The thing Dr. Negrín hopes to obtain through his conversations here in Mexico is an agreement on certain vital issues. He has always insisted that it is more exact to talk about agreement than about unity. Absolute unity at this moment on all the complex problems facing the Republic, both in exile and after its return to Spain, is impossible. The Spanish Republic is not a single-party regime. It is a democracy in which each party has its own ideas about the republic of tomorrow. The issues on which agreement should now be reached are:

1. Coordination of efforts inside and outside Spain to hasten the liberation of the Spanish people and the reestablishment of the Republic.
2. An amnesty which opens the way for a general policy of national reconciliation.
3. Election in Spain of a new Parliament—with the least possible delay after liberation.
4. Continuation of the policy of solidarity with the United Nations, of which the Republic feels morally a part.

To his present mission in Mexico Dr. Negrín brings a record of detachment from the internal conflicts of the emigration. He has always insisted that there are issues which the Spanish people alone can decide, and that these should not be aired abroad. As a result of this attitude Dr. Negrín has been accused of inactivity even by some of his closest

friends and followers. But now, because of his silence in the midst of factional dispute, he is in an excellent position to carry out the task of conciliation he has undertaken here.

During his visit to France early this winter there was not a single Republican party or group, not a single individual who had taken an active part in the Spanish political and labor movements, whom Dr. Negrín failed to approach. Nor did he ignore those who had distinguished themselves by opposing his policies during the war and after; indeed, he even visited and sought the agreement of men who had denounced and slandered him.

In Mexico Dr. Negrín will follow the same course. His dominating concern is to bring about the restoration of the Republic with a minimum of violence and to establish rapidly the peace and order necessary for reconstructing the country. If his plan were put to a vote, an overwhelming majority of Spanish Republicans would support it. In fact, it is hard to see how it can be opposed, especially since he refuses to make an issue of his own retention of the Premiership. He is determined to facilitate the formation of a government under any Republican leader chosen according to constitutional requirements; with only one condition—that the new regime is truly inclusive and represents substantial agreement among the Republican groups. Dr. Negrín will oppose a solution that excludes any party or labor organization that fought to the end in defense of the Republic, first, because such exclusion would be morally unjustified, and, secondly, because he wishes Spain to avoid the experience of Greece, where civil war followed close on the heels of liberation. While it goes without saying that Dr. Negrín would, if it became necessary, fight for the reestablishment of the Republic with the same determination that he displayed in defending it against Axis aggression, he will do everything in his power to create peace in Spain and harmony among Spaniards. He looks upon this as essential if Spain is to play the part it should in the rebuilding of Europe.

We Spaniards are not interested only in bringing back the Republic and enjoying a deserved peace after nine years of war—because for us the war that began in 1936 is not yet over. We are not indulging in quixotic fancies when we claim that no country understands better than Spain the meaning of the fight against fascism. Political victory in this world war is far from won, and we know that Spain can help immeasurably to win it. We are not arrogant, but we are confident; our record gives us the right to believe in the contribution the Spanish Republic can make to the democratic reconstruction of the world. A Republican government in exile must be formed now to carry out this program and to break the present diplomatic stalemate that operates to keep the Franco regime in power.

At the San Francisco conference the first official steps were taken to present the case of the Spanish Republic to the governments of the United Nations. In addition to the direct, personal activities of the Republican Prime Minister and myself, and to negotiations which cannot now be discussed, a letter was addressed to the four chairmen of the conference on April 27. This communication, which has not been made public until now, reads as follows:

Mr. President: As a Minister of the constitutional government of Spain, and by decision of the government, I have the honor to express to Your Excellency the most categorical reservation in regard to the decision to consider Spain a neutral country in the present world war, thus preventing its participation in the San Francisco Conference.

Such a decision ignores the fact that during three years, and before any other European people, the people of Spain fought alone against German-Italian totalitarianism in defense of its independence and its democratic institutions; it ignores also the fact that neither the Spanish people nor their legitimate representatives ever yielded or gave up the fight.

Conscious, nevertheless, of the great responsibilities which in the present hour rest upon all of us, I limit myself to expressing this reservation to Your Excellency and to stating our solemn protest, without adding any petition or demand, since we take into account that two of the inviting powers and a considerable number of participating powers maintain relations with the regime of force established in our country by the rebels as a consequence of an internal aggression provoked by Mussolini and Hitler in a form and under conditions identical with those used by fascism in its later attacks on other countries.

Accept, Mr. President, the expression of my highest consideration. (Signed) JULIO ALVAREZ DEL VAYO,
Foreign Minister of the Spanish Republic

The resolution introduced by the Mexican delegation excluding the Franco dictatorship from the World Security Organization was approved by acclamation. It will be immensely useful in exposing to the people of the whole world the character of the present Spanish regime. But it might also have produced decisive practical results had the legitimate government of Spain been able to speak for all Republican groups. In that case the nations which have never recognized, or have broken relations with, the Franco regime might well have issued statements in support of the Republic which would have been equivalent to recognition. Public opinion in the United States, always sympathetic to the Republic, would have been galvanized into action; there would have been swift repercussions in London; and a new chain of events would have been initiated that would have fully exploited the diplomatic value of the San Francisco resolution.

But the disunity of the Spanish Republicans has prevented even nations favorably disposed toward our cause from taking positive steps toward recognition. No government wishes to give the appearance of supporting one exile political group against another. This is true even of Mexico, which more than any other country has demonstrated its ardent sympathy for the Republican position. Both President Avila Camacho and former President Lazaro Cárdenas have done their utmost for the Spanish Republic. But their efforts have been hampered by the conflicting claims of various factions. Other governments less favorably disposed have used these divisions as a welcome pretext to avoid taking the logical step after San Francisco—breaking relations with Franco.

Because Dr. Negrín's visit to Mexico holds out the hope that, through reconciliation of divergent elements, a peaceful restoration of the Republic can be brought about, the great mass of Spanish exiles, here and everywhere, are following his activities with passionate interest.

Can UNRRA Stop Famine?

BY JOHN CORSON

AMID the rejoicing over the signing of the United Nations Charter there sounds a discouraging, realistic note. It is the voice of Herbert H. Lehman, director general of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. Governor Lehman pleads for real international collaboration—not the kind that is concluded with the signing of a charter, but the kind that will deliver food, clothing, and medicines to the victims of this war.

Less than two years ago there was similar rejoicing when the agreement creating UNRRA was signed. In it the United Nations promised to collaborate in bringing prompt relief to the war-ravaged countries. But though these countries have been liberated, their peoples continue to suffer. Reports accumulate of hunger, cold, distress, starvation, and death. International collaboration has not yet fed or clothed these people as well as the Germans did. And in the coming winter food, clothing, and coal will be scarcer in Europe than in any other winter for decades. Has the UNRRA failed to measure up to its job or is international collaboration already faltering?

Look back over the past two years. A committee representing all European Allied governments and the United States estimated as early as September, 1943, the minimum amount of "foodstuffs, raw materials, and articles of prime necessity" needed in each Allied country during the six months following liberation. But Allied military authorities, who controlled shipping and supplies, never accepted the responsibility of providing for these minimum needs. Rather, they scaled down the estimates of food and other basic imports for civilian populations to an amount calculated to be sufficient "to prevent disease and unrest."

Not even supplies sufficient to prevent "disease and unrest" have been provided. Last autumn the Allied leaders decided that the liberated peoples would be aided most by knocking out Germany finally, completely, and immediately. Hence the bulk of all supplies was given to the armies. Civilians were allotted only the bare minimum necessary to prevent disorder. If the war had ended in Europe sixty days after this decision, the choice would have been justified; as the war continued, people in France, Belgium, the Netherlands, Greece, and elsewhere starved on hopes.

Take France, for example. During the six months following liberation the military authorities shipped in for civilians 262,150 tons of food, clothing, medical supplies, and petroleum. This volume represented *less than one-fifth* of the supplies estimated to be necessary "to prevent disease and unrest." And the need was greater than had been estimated. But there were not enough ships to bring supplies both for the armies and for French civilians.

The Allied radio had promised that relief would be available after liberation. "Strike down your oppressors and win both freedom and food" was the line. Military government

and the distribution of food, clothing, and medicine by soldiers was not what these long-suffering people were led to expect. But UNRRA, in each country, instead of doing the emergency job of civilian relief for which it was organized, has had to await the military's pleasure.

The governments of the liberated areas themselves have also kept UNRRA waiting. France, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Norway announced that they would not require UNRRA's assistance. And the first resolution adopted by the representatives of the forty-four collaborating nations that make up the UNRRA Council dictates that UNRRA shall not operate in any country unless the government of that country requests aid.

But why should these governments, whose peoples are suffering, not request aid? In the first place, each of the Western European countries had substantial balances of foreign exchange with which supplies could be bought, and they proudly believed that, when liberated, they could cope with the urgent needs of their own people. Then, too, the men who made up these exiled governments feared that reliance on "outsiders" would weaken their position at home.

In the second place, UNRRA's resolutions require each nation that requests aid to pass a "means test"—that is, the nation must reveal its resources to representatives of five other nations and must take a "pauper's oath" that it is unable to pay for aid in foreign exchange. Nations, like individuals, can be dissuaded from seeking relief by the application of a means test.

In the third place, these governments allege that they fear UNRRA's encroachment on their national sovereignty. Marshal Tito, for example, refused for months to accept aid for Yugoslavia, fearing that the presence of Allied staff members in his country to observe that the supplies were distributed equitably, as UNRRA's charter requires, would abridge the national sovereignty of Yugoslavia. China eagerly looked for supplies but asked why UNRRA should want an office in China and a nuclear staff to report on the use made of these supplies. Similarly, Premier Osobka Morawski of the new Polish Provisional Government objected to having UNRRA's representatives visit Poland and received the backing of the Soviet Union.

Taxpayers in this country, the United Kingdom, Canada, Australia, and Brazil view UNRRA as an agency through which their philanthropy is distributed. But the heads of state in liberated countries have a different view. They believe assistance is due their peoples for resisting or throwing back the common enemy. If as sovereign members of the fraternity of the United Nations they are to receive aid, they insist it be on their terms. Only Greece, destitute and flat on its back, seeks help without reservation. Mr. Hoover, heading an agency responsible only to itself, could distribute relief on a "take it or leave it" basis. Governor Lehman, distributing relief for an association of nations, must conform not only to the

will of the group but to the will of each member nation.

But even if UNRRA had received the cooperation of the military authorities and been welcomed by the governments of the liberated countries, it would have been unable to meet the people's needs. UNRRA simply has not been able yet to translate the promises of its member nations into food, clothing, and medicines. Great Britain agreed to contribute £80,000,000, and Parliament promptly appropriated this sum. The United States agreed to contribute \$1,350,000,000 and has already appropriated \$800,000,000. Canada has provided \$77,000,000. Australia, Brazil, Iceland, Mexico, New Zealand, and others have formally agreed to contribute their respective shares—90 per cent of which must be used to purchase supplies in the contributing country. But legislation confirming the UNRRA agreement, or even appropriations, won't fill hungry stomachs or clothe children. Relief means flour or meat unloaded at Le Havre, clothing delivered in Brussels or Antwerp, shoes given out for bare feet in Athens, medical supplies deposited along the Dalmatian coast. UNRRA can go on with its job of aiding the tragically displaced persons of all nationalities to find their way home from Germany, but to discharge its primary duty it must have supplies and ships.

In Great Britain the total production has so far been inadequate to provision the British troops at home and in Europe and to meet the sharply rationed needs of civilians. In Australia available products are insufficient to provision the armies and navies operating in the Pacific, feed the population, and leave any substantial quantities for UNRRA. Even in Brazil, Canada, and Mexico essential food, textiles, and other supplies have been competed for by the armies and local consumers.

The United States' contribution to UNRRA's resources is proportionately no greater than that of our less rich collaborators. Yet it represents UNRRA's principal source of supply. So far the drain on this reservoir has been very small. The real sacrifices ahead only became apparent in March when former "Assistant President" Byrnes created a committee of government executives to consider how a scarce food supply should be distributed. On March 13 three members of the United States Senate rose to demand that the committee should "dam the flow abroad of food" while shortages of meat, butter, and other food staples existed at home. President Roosevelt immediately countered with the hope that the United States would, as a matter of common decency, share its food.

As yet his hope has not been realized. Of 200,000,000 pounds of meat promised to UNRRA for the second half of this year, 14,000,000 pounds are to be made available. UNRRA's requirements of dried fish, milk powder, and dried eggs for babies and mothers and of essential fats have also been drastically cut. If UNRRA is to meet the minimum needs of Europe's liberated peoples during the second half of this year, this country's consumption of evaporated milk, meat, fats, soap, cheese, eggs, and margarine must certainly be curtailed. This is the price of preventing starvation among the Greeks, Yugoslavs, Czechs, Chinese, and Poles. Is the desire of the American people to collaborate in this international humanitarian undertaking equal to the test?

Perhaps the United Nations did not foresee that their pledges of collaboration would be put to such an earthy test. But surely the statesmen who created this new international institution knew that national political and economic interests must be subordinated to the common desire to relieve human distress. UNRRA's experience is hardly a good augury for other international institutions.

First, consider its experience with Poland. In September, 1944, discussions with the Polish government in exile, which had been going on since 1943, were interrupted by a telegram from the "Lublin committee" requesting aid. UNRRA offered to send a group of technical experts at once to survey Poland's needs and plan UNRRA's action. From that moment until the Big Three officially buried the Polish government in exile at Yalta UNRRA was "in the middle." It expressed full willingness to deal with whichever group could bring relief to the Polish people. But supplies could be delivered only through territory of the Soviet Union and to a Poland controlled by the Red Army. For four months, from September, 1944, until February, 1945, just before the Yalta conference, the Soviet Union failed to reply to repeated inquiries as to whether supplies for Poland could be shipped through Soviet territory. The Soviet Union did not grant visas applied for by UNRRA's technical experts in November, 1944, until July, 1945.

Yugoslavia is a second example. Hunger and distress there have been acute, particularly along the Dalmatian coast. Representatives of the Soviet Union vigorously urged, as early as July, 1944, that UNRRA should deliver supplies to Marshal Tito for the small area then liberated. UNRRA was willing. Anglo-American military authorities said it was impracticable to distribute relief in Yugoslavia and refused to turn supplies over to UNRRA for this purpose. But subsequently Allied military authorities negotiated with Tito as to when and how their forces might bring relief to the Yugoslavs. Tito apparently did not relish American and British soldiers distributing relief in his country: his partisans had liberated the land; the Allied armies were not needed to fight Germans. Did not the Anglo-American authorities trust their partisan Yugoslav allies sufficiently to turn over relief supplies? he asked. And he doubtless wondered whether the Anglo-American authorities wanted to have their uniformed forces bring relief in order to counteract the influence reflected in the often-displayed hammer and sickle and the use of the new personal address—"Comrade."

The third and most costly example is Greece. UNRRA's staff went into Greece with the first Anglo-American military forces as the "agents of the military." Two United States Senators, Harold H. Burton of Ohio and James M. Tunnell of Delaware, visited the Middle East shortly after the strife in Greece and had an opportunity to appraise the results of this arrangement. Each reported to his Senate colleagues in February that in his opinion the British military forces "used that relief organization in an improper manner by integrating its representatives with the armed forces." In short, the British made UNRRA's representatives seem benevolent agents of their military forces.

UNRRA's representatives, let it be said to their honor, did their best through the civil strife to see that relief supplies were distributed to both ELAS and government supporters.

Seven UNRRA staff members were shot while carrying on their tasks, and one was killed. But UNRRA lost its impartial international status in the eyes of many of our friends in the Balkans.

To cope with these problems of national pride, competition from the military forces, promises of collaboration only partially met, and international politics, UNRRA has had a devoted but inexperienced staff. UNRRA has brought together 3,000 persons of more than 30 different nationalities. They are located in London, Paris, Cairo, Athens, Rome, Belgrade, Addis Ababa, Rio de Janeiro, Sydney, and Chungking, as well as Washington. Within eighteen months UNRRA has had to mobilize this variegated group, weld them into an integrated efficient unit, and improvise methods of doing its job while actually carrying on the job. That so much is still uncompleted is not surprising.

UNRRA has been severely criticized for its ineffectiveness. Lord Strabolgi in the House of Lords has dubbed it "UNRRA the unready," and Lord Beaverbrook's *Daily Express* lambasts it as a "top-heavy, muscle-bound bureaucracy." American newspapers describe it as poorly organized, over-cautious, over-centralized, and lacking essential imaginative leadership and drive. Having been a part of the organization so recently, I cannot appraise these criticisms

objectively. Yet I believe that within a year UNRRA has built as efficient an organization as the time would permit. The machinery still creaks, but less than it did six months ago. Given a chance, Governor Lehman and his colleagues can do the job. To charge UNRRA's failures to weakness of organization is to miss the salutary lessons which its experience teaches.

UNRRA's existence reflects the popular will, throughout the United Nations, to collaborate in making the future world secure. But UNRRA's experience indicates that effective collaboration for relief demands more than good-will. Though its failures are due in part to the unyielding scarcity of essential supplies and ships, they are due also to the unwillingness of the various states to compromise on matters affecting their political and economic interests or to restrain the bureaucrats—in brass hats or in Homburgs—who would substitute their own or their department's policy for this country's avowed policy of international collaboration. The hope of a world made secure by the cooperation of its states in relief, finance, agriculture, civil aviation, and the maintenance of order can be brought nearer realization if advantage is taken of the lessons to be learned from UNRRA. Its experience to date makes the promise of San Francisco appear somewhat less bright.

Ferruccio Parri

BY GAETANO SALVEMINI

FERRUCCIO PARRI is fifty-five years old: that is, he belongs to the generation that was twenty-five or thirty when the Fascist movement came to power in Italy. He and his contemporaries saw pre-Fascist Italy, and after the tragic experience of Fascism they can appreciate with a mature mind its faults, which were many, and its merits, which were few. It is they who must assume the gigantic task of rebuilding their country on the ruins caused by twenty-five years of evil and stupidity. It is they who must fight against the domestic and foreign forces which will do everything possible to hinder the second Italian Risorgimento. Ferruccio Parri is one of the best of that generation.

In 1915, when Italy joined the Triple Entente in its war against the Central Powers, Parri was an instructor in history in a high school. Tall, pale, with beautiful dark eyes and a great shock of black hair, as severe with himself as with others in the fulfilment of duty, Parri was adored by his pupils. The free Italy of those days had many similar teachers, men who devoted their lives to study and teaching, content with a humble economic status, incorruptible ministers of the faith in truth which will save mankind. Even in the worst years of tyranny these teachers kept alive the scholastic traditions of the old free Italy.

Parri, like all the best youth of his generation, was an "interventionist": that is, he favored Italy's intervention in the European war. English and French politicians announced that they were not waging war for territorial conquests in Europe or for colonial expansion outside Europe. The

European map would be redrawn according to national self-determination. The rights of the smaller nations would be as securely guaranteed as those of the great powers. Parri was one of those who wanted Italy to share the sacrifices in that war which was going to obtain justice for all, and then to get its share of justice. He never supported the campaign waged by the Italian nationalists, the forerunners of the Fascists, for the conquest of Dalmatia. The Italian Risorgimento had stopped at "*Trento e Trieste*." Parri was faithful to that tradition. He wanted no less, but certainly no more. Italy's war with the Central Powers was to be the last war of the Italian Risorgimento and was to give the final touch to national unification.

As a rule teachers in all countries prove excellent officers. For his intelligence and bravery Parri was promoted from lieutenant to captain and then to major. He took part in nine offensives. He was decorated four times for acts of valor and also received the French *Croix de Guerre* and the Italian *Croce per Merito di Guerra*.

He followed President Wilson's work with enthusiasm. When Leonida Bissolati resigned from the Orlando-Sonnino Cabinet because he would not associate himself with its demands for Dalmatia and openly defied the nationalists and Mussolini, Ferruccio Parri took sides with him, while Ivanoe Bonomi, who had been Bissolati's follower and friend, betrayed him by taking his place in the Cabinet.

After his discharge from military service, Parri worked as an assistant editor of the *Corriere della Sera* until No-

ember, 1925, when the chief editor, Senator Albertini, was forced to give up his post to a Fascist. Parri refused to work under the new editor, although he was offered an excellent salary. But he did not remain idle. He became secret correspondent of the daily *Corriere degli Italiani*, put out, under the direction of Giuseppe Donati, by anti-Fascists who had taken refuge in France. Almost all the reports from Italy published by this paper in 1926 were the work of Parri.

In November, 1926, the reports ceased. Parri, together with Carlo Rosselli, was planning to effect the escape from Italy of the leader of the Socialist Party, Filippo Turati, a man of seventy, ill, kept in house arrest, and threatened with internment on a penal island. Turati escaped through a service stairway while the guards posted at his front door were chatting. A taxi driver, one of those humble heroes who were to be found by the thousand in Italy, and whose name, unfortunately, I do not know, drove the three fugitives to a country house near Varese which belonged to a close friend of Turati. From Varese, passing from one person to another and never being betrayed, Turati, Rosselli, and Parri arrived at a point near Savona. Here they boarded a motor boat piloted by Italo Oxilia, another humble hero. Carlo Rosselli paid all the expenses with the generosity which his wealth allowed him.

Parri and Rosselli, after bringing Turati to safety, returned to Italy. Italy was their field of battle against Fascism. There they intended to take up the fight again. As they landed on the coast of Tuscany, they were stopped by customs guards. The police, of course, suspected that they had had a hand in Turati's escape. They did not deny the "crime." Since they were in the hands of the enemy, the best tactics were to challenge him openly, come what might. According to Fascist law, persons charged with the "crime" of complicity in "unauthorized expatriation" were granted liberty while awaiting trial. The judge at Savona, therefore, ordered the two defendants to be set free. But the police intervened and sent them to the island of Ustica for internment until they should be tried.

Persons sentenced to internment were transported in railway coaches divided lengthwise by a passageway into two lines of cells, one for each prisoner. A chain went from one cell to another through apertures in the side walls and bound all the prisoners together by their wrists in such a way that if one of them made an abrupt motion the others were injured. The only ventilation in each cell came through a tiny observation hole in the door leading to the central passage. The cell was bitterly cold in winter and suffocating in summer. Each evening the train stopped at a station, and the prisoners, handcuffed and chained together, with their packs on their backs, were taken in closed horse-drawn vans to the local jail, where they ate supper and spent the night. They received no other food. Some men traveled under these conditions of torture for two months. Mussolini hoped by this means to undermine either their will-power or their health.

Carlo Rosselli has described the night which Parri and he spent in the prison at Palermo before they were taken to the penal island of Ustica:

There are at least a hundred of us in the "well," which is the section for transients in the Palermo prison. Around us confusion and squalor. Convicts enjoying a break in their

usual routine, gangsters evacuated from their customary sewer-like quarters, prisoners technically freed who still have weeks to wait before their release, political prisoners like ourselves. . . . Sleep is impossible. I look at Parri. His slender, pale face framed by a three weeks' beard is the picture of nobility, Parri is my second conscience, my elder brother. If my imprisonment had given me nothing more, his melancholy friendship would be enough of a reward. . . . Before I knew Parri the hero of the Mazzini stamp seemed to me abstract and rhetorical. Now I see him lying near me with the sorrow of the world, and all its spiritual energy, engraved on his face.

In May of 1927, while Parri and Rosselli were confined on the island of Ustica, Mussolini told the Chamber of Deputies that the anti-Fascists sentenced to compulsory domicile were beginning to see the light and that several of them had written him letters of submission. When Parri, Rosselli, and another man of unyielding character, Riccardo Bauer, read in the newspapers what Mussolini had said, they wrote him that they had made no act of repentance or submission and did not intend to do so. This letter Mussolini did not read to the Chamber of Deputies.

After a month at Ustica Parri had to make the painful trip back to Savona. Here, on the eve of the public trial, he and Rosselli decided to define in writing their attitude toward the Fascist regime. I give Parri's statement in part:

I have no personal grudge against the Fascist regime. I pride myself on having served the Italian state in peace and war with loyalty and self-sacrifice. I have never followed extremist political movements. I have never had any political ambitions. I have always kept out of political parties. I have no responsibility for the disorder of the years immediately after the war. . . . My hate of Fascism has moral grounds. I uncompromisingly repudiate the whole atmosphere of Fascism. My feelings are shared by thousands of young men. Yesterday soldiers fighting for their country, today they are enemies of the rhetoric and corruption typical of the Fascist regime. To these young men Fascism must and will render strict account of the wounds it has inflicted on the nation. The regime can persecute and scatter them; it will never stifle their opposition. . . . We hold as certain that the ideals of liberty and justice, misunderstood and mute in times of servitude, are imperishable. We recognize each other by our faith in these ideals; we recognize Fascism in its contempt for them. Against our persons Fascism can use bludgeons and handcuffs; against our faith it is powerless. Fascism brands us as "unpatriotic." But after teaching Italian history in our schools, after serving my country in war, I know that the example of the Risorgimento and of 1915 shows us our duty today.

When in November of 1926 all remnants of resistance were suppressed in Italy, I felt it my duty to make a protest which should declare my faith in a better Italy. This protest could only be made public abroad. . . . Thanks to his fine character and an honorable and dignified life, Signor Turati is well fitted to present to civilized Europe our protest against the darkness that has fallen upon our country and our faith in an Italy which will give equal liberty to all Italians. Since Fascist law calls us to account for what we have done, we assert with pride our responsibility. Our pride is the greater today when the degradation and hypocrisy of public life and the cowardice of the ruling classes call for an example of sacrifice and of loyalty to ideals. Today

there is no break in the clouds on the horizon. But we have steadfast faith in the future. Gentlemen, the Fascist regime, in sentencing us, will honor us.

At the trial Parri and Rosselli resolutely took the offensive, accusing the Fascist government of having treated Turati illegally and unjustly and having compelled him to go into exile if he were to save his dignity and, indeed, his life. Tall, thin, and pale, Parri described the infernal conditions of existence in Milan in November, 1926. "Had I been in England, that is, in a civilized country," he said, "I could have legally contested the legitimacy of Fascist law. In Italy that was impossible. But I refused to recognize its legitimacy. That is why I violated it with open eyes and full awareness of what I was doing." "Bravo," came a voice from the audience. It was the voice of Parri's old father. Then came Rosselli's turn. Claiming a full share of the responsibility for Turati's escape, he said that half a century earlier one of his ancestors had welcomed and hidden the dying Mazzini in his house at Pisa. When he himself had carried one of the finest of Italians to safety outside Italy he had only followed the example, almost the command, of his heritage.

The judges were amazed at the spirit of these two young men; the public was electrified. During the wait for the sentence the courtroom, the halls, the stairways, the whole neighborhood were crowded with people. Fascist law made the crime of unauthorized expatriation punishable by a minimum of ten months of prison if there were no political motives and by a maximum of six years if there were such motives. After four hours of discussion the three judges gave the accused the minimum sentence of ten months for their complicity in an unauthorized expatriation without political motives. The crowd burst into wild applause for the victory of the two young men against an oppressive government which no one had hitherto dared to challenge.

After he had served his ten months in prison, Carlo Rosselli was interned on the penal island of Lipari, from which he escaped a year later, in July of 1929. Parri was freed, but from 1928 to 1943 the police of Milan kept special watch over him. He was by no means inactive during those years. He took part in the underground *Giustizia e Libertà* movement. He escaped arrest by a miracle when, toward the end of 1930, various leaders and members of this movement—Ernesto Rossi, Riccardo Bauer, Nicola Fancello, and Nello Traquandi, among others—were seized and sentenced first to jail and later to internment on a penal island, where they remained until 1943. Amid the general hopelessness Parri steadfastly refused to make any compromise with the victorious Fascist regime.

I am not so well informed as I should like to be on Parri's activities since the fall of Mussolini. Last autumn very few of us knew which of the partisans was "General Maurizio" or "the Uncle," and those who did know guarded their secret. Many times in recent months I have been asked whom I would suggest as leader of the democratic Italian republic. I always answered, "It is not up to me any more than it is up to Mr. Churchill to name the future leader. The Italians will choose their own leader when they can." But Parri was in my mind.

One story of his life as a partisan reached me two months ago from Switzerland and has now been confirmed by an O.N.A. dispatch from Milan dated June 18. In January of

1945 Parri fell into a trap laid by the Gestapo. He was saved by the generosity and quick wit of an American major, who signed the name of General Clark to a message addressed to the German command saying that if Parri were not released at once to Switzerland, high Gestapo officials held by the Allies would pay for his life with theirs. This was language that the Germans could understand. Parri was taken immediately to the Swiss frontier. From there he quickly returned to Italy and took up his work again.

And today he is Premier of Italy.

Chicago the Beautiful

BY RAY RUNNION

THE rest of the country associates the name of Chicago with gang killings and the radio voice of Mayor Kelly's sewer commissioner, who was the phantom cheerleader at the 1940 Democratic National Convention. Local citizens have an ingrained belief that the city is incurably ugly, noisy, inconvenient, and rapacious. But strange as it may seem, Chicago is currently exhibiting symptoms of a civic conscience. There is evidence that it is entering a period that should produce something more deserving of community pride than livestock receipts or lake-front embellishments.

Since the first of the year the voters have approved by referendum a state law creating a public transit authority for the acquisition and modernization of the decrepit and bankrupt elevated and surface lines. (Seventy-five years of private ownership have left a legacy of rattling elevated trains that carry kerosene tail lanterns and of street cars that were new in the Theodore Roosevelt era.) The legislature has passed a series of laws to permit far-reaching slum clearance under municipal auspices. The Chicago Park District has been voted \$24,000,000 to finance the first four years of a ten-year program of bringing green open spaces to the city's congested areas. The Chicago Plan Commission has prepared an extraordinary post-war improvement program, ranging from new schools to new subways. The Mayor's Race Relations Committee is attacking in a down-to-earth way the factors that foster racial discontent, with special commissions covering the fields of housing, employment, health, law and order, education, and recreation.

The transit and slum-clearance programs are the product of an unprecedented collaboration between Mayor Kelly, a Democrat, and Governor Green, a Republican, which brought about the enactment of the necessary laws by the legislature, both houses of which have Republican majorities. In the ideal political society such cooperation between state and municipal executives for the public welfare would perhaps be taken for granted. In Illinois the discovery that the waters of Lake Michigan had suddenly acquired a pleasant vanilla flavor would have been hardly more astonishing.

Kelly fought Green hard in the November election and lost, though President Roosevelt carried the state. A few months later Kelly went to Springfield to confer with the Governor on a legislative program for Chicago. Kelly's political doctrine, he frankly announced, is, "If you can't lick 'em, jine 'em."

To soothe downstate Republicans, who always view Chicago as a sink of iniquity, Green enlisted the forensics of Werner W. Schroeder, Republican national committeeman. Schroeder brushed up on the tortuous transit problem and made several persuasive appearances as a witness before legislative committees. The legislators were impressed by the spectacle of a deep-dyed conservative arguing for a public-ownership policy that once would have been denounced as socialistic. As a result the transit and slum-clearance laws were passed with scant opposition, though not without grumblings from Republican members from rural sections who feared the political consequences of collaborating with the Chicago machine.

The Kelly-Green alliance is not hard to explain. It was simply good politics for both men to take up the causes they are jointly supporting. The two apparently realized that the mass of Chicago's citizens, like those of many other cities, want to see something worth-while emerge from the disruption of the war period. People were beginning to scrutinize the city's lacks and defects and to protest against their continuation. There was no answer to the argument that private ownership of the transit facilities had completely broken down under the dead weight of receiverships and wrangling bondholders' committees. To have opposed slum clearance would have been to approve the undisputed social decay that slums produce. Kelly, who had seen himself depicted throughout the country as the symbol of political bossism, is credited with a sincere desire for constructive accomplishment. Green is young and seems politically ambitious.

To the credit of both, the public-ownership program came into being without demagogic promises of lower fares. A subsidized five-cent fare like that of New York is in effect outlawed by a requirement that the Chicago Transit Authority must make good by its own efforts. The proponents of public ownership argued frankly that since a publicly owned transit system would be free of income and other taxes and could sell its tax-exempt securities at a low price, it would have greater resources for modernization and expansion. A \$100,000,000 replacement program has been scheduled for the next ten years. A transit board appointed jointly by Kelly and Green has begun to function, but actual acquisition of the properties awaits the conclusion of bankruptcy litigation in the federal court.

For slum clearance an initial fund of \$10,000,000 is provided, half through a special bond issue and half through an appropriation from the state's accumulated surplus. Since this sum will only do the spadework in correcting Chicago's vast housing deficiencies, present plans are regarded as the nucleus of a far-reaching program to be carried out after the war, entailing the possible expenditure of \$100,000,000 of city, state, and federal funds. The City Council's housing committee is basing its policies on the statistical fact that in 1940 the income of 23 per cent of Chicago's families was \$1,200 or less. The Chicago program, therefore, emphasizes the construction of low-rental housing units.

Despite all this there are no signs that Chicago is nearing a bipartisan millennium. Kelly and Green failed to cooperate in a citizen-sponsored movement for a new constitution and in efforts to obtain a state fair-employment-practices act; both proposals were rejected. Moreover, there has been a

revival of commercialized gambling, with eight gang killings since the first of the year. What has happened is that Chicago, made self-critical by the disturbing events of the war period, has discovered that its physical development has become, in Lewis Mumford's phrase describing American cities, "a crystallization of chaos." The discovery is late, and the corrective surgery will be costly. The important thing at the moment is that Chicago is a more humble and more introspective city than the one which a few years ago gaudily celebrated its glories in a "Century of Progress" exposition that prominently featured the fan-dancing of Sally Rand.

In the Wind

A SOLDIER JUST IN from Italy brings this story. The American ambassador, Alexander C. Kirk, gave a reception in Rome for members of the staffs of *Yank*, *Stars and Stripes*, and the American Expeditionary [radio] Station. He told a soldier connected with the station, "Broadcasting is one of the things that will survive the war." The soldier said, "Soap opera will die with us," and the Ambassador replied, "I manufacture soap."

THE FAMOUS ANGLO-EGYPTIAN censorship is still doing the things that made it famous. These are some of the instructions it issued to the Egyptian press on June 4: "It is forbidden: (1) to mention the visit of the Minister of the U. S. S. R. to the Egyptian Prime Minister and the note relative to the Russian point of view on the questions of Syria and the Lebanon; . . . (4) to mention any statement attributed to General Paget; (5) relative to the declaration made on the third of this month by the president of the Syrian Chamber to the journalists gathered at the Lebanese Legation in Cairo, to mention (a) that the British have given 5,000 rifles to the Syrians and (b) that they have given 35,000 tons of wheat to the Syrians. . . ."

IF THERE IS sufficient demand, the United Nations Information Organization and the Library of Congress will publish the official documentation of the San Francisco conference. The documents will fill 12,000 pages, and it is planned to publish them in eight volumes. Inquiries should be addressed to the Secretary General, United Nations Information Office, 610 Fifth Avenue, New York 20, N. Y.

THE STRIKE OF NEW YORK'S newspaper deliverymen is having repercussions in nearby resort towns. This is from a special report to the *New York Times* from Asbury Park, New Jersey, on July 11: "One amusing by-product of the strike was the sight of a well-known member of the New York Stock Exchange seated in his chauffeur-driven car at the station reading a copy of the *Daily Worker*."

[We invite our readers to submit material for *In the Wind*—either clippings with source and date or stories that can be clearly authenticated. We will pay \$1 for each item accepted—EDITORS THE NATION.]

BOOKS and the ARTS

NOTES BY THE WAY

BY MARGARET MARSHALL

LAST fall I noted that the head of Time, Inc., had it in mind to add a "little magazine" to his high-powered, fast-running journalistic stable. *Opinions and Ideas* or *Opinion and Thought*, whatever it is to be called, has now actually set up shop; but according to reports it is planning to invade the field not only of the little magazines and the more conventional quarterlies but of *The Nation* and the *New Republic*.

The project of a magazine of ideas financed and controlled by big business which also happens to be big journalism and aimed at the vaguely liberal reading public, which is rather large in this country, suggests pretty sinister possibilities. Come to think of it, the new incarnation of American imperialism might well bear the label of National Liberalism; if it took as its slogan The American Century of the Common Man it might go far in a post-war period of disillusion and confusion; and considering the auspices under which *Opinions and Ideas* is being launched, such a magazine would be a likely candidate for highbrow spokesman of such a development.

I doubt very much that these obvious implications have risen to the consciousness of Luce or of his editorial collaborators. The new venture would have less chance of success if they had. Luce is one of those "naturals" whose strength is as the strength of ten because he is, at most, only half-aware of what he is doing. I am sure he considers himself "progressive"; he is no doubt convinced that his advocacy of the American Century is based on a disinterested desire to carry the benefits of the American way to the millions of outlying natives with whose welfare he has always been concerned—his missionary background should never be forgotten. The editor in charge of the projected magazine is Willi Schlamm, a disillusioned Marxist who has apparently found it possible to accept the Lucite illusion that there is no reason why Time, Inc., should not be the sponsor of a liberal magazine to put all other liberal magazines in the shade.

This is a combination whose strength, as I have already indicated, lies in its very presumption and naivete. But its weakness lies in the same quarter. It is quite likely that *Opinions and Ideas* will appeal to those liberal readers who are more or less vague, indiscriminating, or confused. There are plenty of writers who as liberals are confused or disillusioned or both. These would seem to be the natural contributors to a "liberal" magazine sponsored by Luce. But *Opinions and Ideas*, to my knowledge, is trying to enlist what might be designated as left literary writers who are not at all indiscriminating and to whom, for instance, Time, Inc., is the last word in philistinism, political and other. This is further evidence of the basic obtuseness of Luce thinking. Here again, I suspect the motive is a mixture of a desire to prove that even the most advanced writers can do their most advanced writing for a Luce publication and the

imperial-missionary urge to gather in those spirited mavericks, left or literary or both, who obviously should have the benefit of safe, richly grassed pastures.

I very much doubt that these authors will find it possible to collaborate. The prospect of getting paid three or four hundred dollars for a serious "highbrow" article will be very tempting to American writers, whose feelings about writing and money are, for obvious reasons, ambivalent—living continuously on the edge of a money civilization is difficult and frustrating. But as long as *Opinions and Ideas* is owned by Time, Inc., a writer of political discrimination will see it in that frame of reference; no amount of assurance that he can write exactly as he pleases will wipe it out; and in any case he will not write in the same way as he would for *The Nation* or the *Partisan Review*.

Say that such a writer was moved to do a critique of liberal or left ideas. If it was to be published in an authentic liberal or little magazine he would feel quite free to be as severe as he liked because of his consciousness that his readers were liberal or left of liberal and would read his essay as a critique and not as an attack on the liberal or left point of view *per se*. If it was to be published in a magazine which was under the same management as *Time* he would think twice before setting down his opinions and ideas, and that second thought marks the difference between a genuine and a contrived liberal magazine. The writer who wished to write critically of modern art or literature would come up against the same difficulty.

When Lionel Trilling's book on E. M. Forster came out, *Time's* review as it was printed put the main emphasis on Trilling's discussion of Forster's critical remarks about liberalism. I say "as it was printed," because it was pretty clear that the unsigned review had been cut; it was crystal clear that the editors of *Time* were delighted to exhibit liberals finding fault with liberals and had no qualms about pulling the discussion out of its original context and proportion.

I don't mean to imply that articles for *Opinions and Ideas* will be tampered with. My point is that *Opinions and Ideas* must bear the onus of *Time*, whatever convictions to the contrary are entertained by Mr. Schlamm—unless, of course, the first article in the first issue turns out to be a sharp analysis of Time, Inc., of the sort which might be published in *The Nation* or the *Partisan Review*. That would have the double advantage of demonstrating the independence of the editor and the freedom of contributors.

But even if *Opinions and Ideas* is forced, as I think it will be, to change its sights as far as writers are concerned and be content with contributors who are conscious of no anomaly in the conception of a liberal magazine run by Time, Inc., its success would be, to say the least, ominous. It would serve to blur even more the line that divides right from left. And that line has already become difficult enough to distinguish—thanks largely to the confrontation in the current world of a collective state which is totalitarian by capitalist nations in which democratic processes and indi-

vidual liberty are still cherished and continue to flourish, however imperfectly. A magazine that, given its sponsor, could hardly help becoming an apologist for the right while exploiting the traditional principles of the left would be an effective herald for the monstrosity of National Liberalism which I have already postulated. And yet its editors might be the last to realize what function they were performing.

BRIEFER COMMENT

The Irrepressible Morris Ernst

TO REVIEW THE LIFE of Morris Ernst as he exhibits it in "The Best Is Yet" (Harper and Brothers, \$3) in any cool and detached manner would be like reporting a three-alarm fire at the Stork Club in terms of property damage and insurance. This collection of "free-wheeling pieces" which Ernst has dashed off in lieu of an autobiography is either "swell"—a favorite Ernstian adjective—or the opposite, according to how much the reviewer likes the author or how heartily he hates him.

Morris L. Ernst is a lawyer, a member of a firm with offices in New York where such unexciting matters as torts, writs, summonses, and duces tecums are frequently discussed. He is a serious-minded and courageous fighter for the under dog. When I first met him, he was acting as counsel without fee for a committee of public-spirited citizens who were trying to present the anthracite miners' side of one of our perennial coal strikes. Gently and sympathetically, he was drawing from a badly flustered man from the picks the tragic story of life on a Pennsylvania coal patch. Years later, with this story in mind, he defended the desperate anthracite "bootleggers" in a report to Governor Earle of Pennsylvania which deserves to rank with the best of labor documents. He has been in the van of the handful of defenders of our civil liberties; he has fought censorship like an infuriated wildcat; and if in the memory of us iron-gray lads there has been a liberal cause which he has not actively supported, I do not know its name.

Nevertheless, for reasons best known to himself, Morris Ernst chooses to present himself in life and in this book as an "irrepressible"—that's the word on the book's jacket—happy-go-lucky character about town. As some people cannot bear to watch anybody having a good time, and as the accepted picture of the liberal is that of a tight-lipped, sour-faced individual reading the minutes of the previous meeting, I expect that Ernst has gone out of his way to prove that there can be laughter as well as thunder on the left.

MC ALISTER COLEMAN

Data for Governing the Japanese

WHATEVER HARDSHIPS and inconveniences the mass evacuation of 110,000 persons of Japanese ancestry from the West Coast may have caused the evacuees and the administration, it has unquestionably proved to be a godsend to sociologists and anthropologists. For to the social scientist mass evacuation has, in effect, created ideal conditions for

observing how people react when the social structure in which they have always functioned is suddenly disrupted, how the family system responds to sudden change, and how, under pressure of events, new types of social organization develop. Owing largely to the foresight and curiosity of John Collier, these opportunities for scientific research and observation have not been lost. Under his auspices, Lieutenant Commander Alexander H. Leighton was enabled to study at first hand a fascinating range of social phenomena in the Poston relocation center and to scrutinize the administration of the project at close range. In "The Governing of Men" (Princeton, \$3.75) he has recorded these phenomena with admirable detachment and attempted to draw from them certain basic conclusions about the governing of men from the standpoint of applied anthropology. Unquestionably, his conclusions can be of incalculable value to the administrators of Iwo Jima, Okinawa, and other areas destined to be brought under American rule as we advance in the Pacific. Whether they will be so utilized, of course, is another matter. The volume is well organized and carefully documented and indexed, and also contains some excellent photographs.

CAREY MC WILLIAMS

East and West

I FOUND A GOOD DEAL of pleasure and some puzzlement in "The Asian Legacy and American Life," edited by A. E. Christy (John Day, an Asia Press book, \$3.50). It consists of a series of essays, some of great value and some quite worthless, on the influence of Asiatic culture and experience upon Western modes.

The first paper, by Arthur E. Christy, seems to me little more than an example of the sort of exercise for which Ph.D.'s are granted, being a historical review, with considerable gaps, of the "literary interest" in Asia. What serious purpose is fulfilled by reminding us at great length that Joseph Addison wrote "The Vision of Mirza" for the *Spectator* and that Beckford composed "Vathek," "an Oriental Gothic thriller," I do not know. A somewhat better paper is that of Curt Sachs on The Orient and Western Music, though Dr. Sachs's frequently over-confident assertions might not always be satisfactory to one who knew, say, the literature of the debate about Arabic influence on Spanish music. Laurence P. Roberts, in The Orient and Western Art, provides an excellent paper, and John Gould Fletcher, in The Orient and Contemporary Poetry, is warmly appreciative of Chinese poetry, imagism, and his own verse. Next comes a really curious piece about the transcendentalist arcana of orientalism, in which we are asked to take Madame Blavatsky and the Rosicrucians seriously—and, believe it or not, Gerald Heard also. Mr. Tindall, the author of this piece, says of Los Angeles, home of strange cults, "The attraction of this place for spiritual men and even for spirits is plain. But I am not sure that I know what it means." And that remark may be applied to the book as a whole. Dr. Coomaraswamy, who commits himself to the usual intellectualist extravagance about the superior "spirituality" of the East, where "*chaque occupation est un sacerdoce*," suggests in Understanding and Reunion that the West must absorb much of the Asian perceptiveness for the truths of art and religion. Pearl Buck

corrects Dr. Coomaraswamy—if I understand her rightly—and declares that we need the Oriental sense of the importance of happiness while the East needs our productive capacity. How these syntheses are to be brought off is not suggested. The whole, if it has any definite basis at all, seems to rest upon the unproved assumption that if we all knew enough about one another we should be able to live in peace.

The difficulty with all such enterprises as this is that the East is as full of contradictory diversity as the West, while the conspicuous weakness of this particular effort is that there is no trace of an account of the solid achievements of the West. To sum up, this well-written book seems to me to have little purpose; yet it is full of that out-of-the-way learning which it is perhaps a personal idiosyncrasy to like. The illustrations are good.

RALPH BATES

Wide-ranging Memories

CHEERFULNESS AND SIMPLICITY characterize the memories which Ella Young has written down in "Flowering Dusk" (Longmans, Green, \$3.50). They range in time over seven decades, and in place from Ireland to California. Miss Young's acquaintance included AE, Yeats, Maude Gonne, the Colums, and the leaders of the Rising; both people and events, however, are presented pleasantly, rather than memorably, in these pages. The author's Irishness is displayed, at times, with a rather self-conscious, arty, of-the-lecture-platform manner; nor is the cliché altogether alien to Miss Young's prose. There are some good stories, though, of the Cave of the Red Steeds, the Boat of the Dead, the music of the Sidhe, and so on. In America Miss Young has traveled extensively, particularly in the West: she knew Robinson and Una Jeffers, Charles Erskine Scott Wood and Sara Bard Field, and Mabel Dodge Luhan, among others. Miss Young seems to be essentially an *amateur*, at times in the best sense of the word, at times in its less happy connotations: the effect of her book, therefore, can be either disarming or annoying. The text is illustrated with half a dozen striking photographic studies of the author.

ROLFE HUMPHRIES

Layman's Guide

POPULARIZATION is a dangerous thing; not primarily because it makes authorities of the uninitiate but because it encourages a tolerance, if not a taste, for baby talk. The bad political influence of the popular magazines is due less to their content than to their style, including that of their most unpolitical illustrations; and many a book intended to enlighten our minds defeats its purpose by stultifying our taste. This is something Goebbels understood much better than the Writers' War Board. The most dangerous thing a writer can do is to fight trash with trash. Such being the state of things, it is a pleasure to report that "The Doctor's Job," by Carl Binger, M.D. (Norton, \$3), is not only good for you but easy to take. That is to say, it presents a complex subject in simple terms without denying its complexity. It is an intelligent layman's guide to contemporary medical thought and practice, with due emphasis on their social aspects.

J. MITCHELL MORSE

Books on Germany

IN "THE JUNKER MENACE" (Richard R. Smith, \$2) Frederick Martin discovers the "logic" of Germany's history in the influence of the Prussian Junkers. Yet the power of the Prussian Junkers was not as exclusive as Mr. Martin pretends, and Germany was not the only country in which a caste of landowners exerted strong and sometimes decisive influence. Mr. Martin's book is full of over-simplifications, exaggerations, distortions of historical facts—all typical of those authors who in writing about Germany offer a very simple formula for the solution of an extremely complicated problem.

Serious information, strongly recommended to Germany's present would-be educators, is given in "From Democracy to Nazism" by Rudolf Heberle (Louisiana State University, \$2.50). In the modest frame of a "regional case study" analyzing the political developments in Schleswig-Holstein, Mr. Heberle, professor of sociology at Louisiana State University, contributes valuable material for an unbiased judgment of the German tragedy. The author shows the fallacy of the popular belief that Prussianism and Junkerism were identical with Nazism.

"A Short History of Germany" by S. H. Steinberg (the Macmillan Company, \$3) presents a reliable catalogue of Germany's developments from the year 911 to the outbreak of the Hitler war. Influenced by Bismarck's federalist opponents (Constantin Frantz), Mr. Steinberg overemphasizes the racial and political differences between the German tribes. He even denies the existence of a "pure German language," except on the stage, and attributes to the various German dialects the quality of languages. There are actually no greater differences between the dialects of Germany than between those found in France, Italy, or America.

A liberal version of the "German case" is given in "Hitler and Beyond—a German Testament" (Knopf, \$2.75) by the late Erich Koch-Weser, once minister of the Weimar Republic and chairman of the German Democratic Party, who died last year in his Brazilian exile. Since Badoglio and even Dönitz were used for the sake of order and expediency, more leniency is required in the judgment of the men of Weimar, who for the same reasons compromised with the Kaiser's generals and unwittingly opened the road for Hindenburg and Hitler. But Koch-Weser goes too far in the defense of his colleagues, especially in his explanations of the Ruhr war and the Weimar reparations policy. Worth reading, however, are the chapters which deal with the question why there was "so little resistance" against Hitler inside Germany: The Opponents of National Socialism, and Foreign Policy. Besides the usual explanations for the success of Hitlerism one finds in Koch-Weser's testament a few remarks in which this good old liberal pointed to the other side of "progress." "A hundred years ago," he wrote, "simple people, peasants and craftsmen, formed their own conception of the world, even though it was a narrow one. . . . Formerly the people knew a great deal or everything about a few things; today they know a little or nothing about all things. . . . Everyone, indeed, still thinks that he has an opinion of his own, but it is an opinion derived from reading, from hearing others speak, from having it drilled into him."

JOSEPH BORNSTEIN

MOTION PICTURES

WARNER BROS. MAGNIFICENT
RHAPSODY
 IN BLUE
 ITS GEORGE GERSHWIN'S
 MAGNIFICENT STORY!
 NOW HOLLYWOOD
 THEATRE

ROBERT CUMMINGS • LISBETH SCOTT • DON De FORE
 In HAL WALLIS' Production
"YOU CAME ALONG"
 A PARAMOUNT PICTURE
 IN PERSON
 STAN KENTON and His Orchestra
 —Also—
 DICK & GENE WESSON
 EXTRA RETURN ENGAGEMENT
 LOUIS JORDAN & His Famous Tympany Five
COOL PARAMOUNT TIMES SQUARE

Get ready to see . . .
 How Wonderful a Motion Picture Version of a Great Stage Play Can Be!
 It's got us all using such expressions as "Natch," "TerRIF" and "SenSASH!" We've even found out that a woman can still be dangerous even if she is old—21! We've just seen a preview of
"JUNIOR MISS"
 You'll cheer! As Peggy Ann Garner, who stole your heart as "Francie" in "A Tree Grows in Brooklyn," emerges as one of the greatest stars of our time. . . . Words alone can't describe how joyously it has been adapted and directed by George Seaton and how magnificently it has been produced by William Perlberg. . . .
 IT'S SUPER ENTERTAINMENT—BUT DIF!
 Proudly presented by 20th Century-Fox
RIVOLI

MUMPHREY
Bogart
 ALEXIS SMITH • SYDNEY GREENSTREET in WARNERS
Conflict
 in LOUIS PRIMA
 AND HIS ORCHESTRA
 Person DANE CLARK "STAR OF HOLLYWOOD CANTOEN"
STRAND

STAGE PLAY

MICHAEL TODD Presents
UP IN CENTRAL PARK
 Book by HERBERT Lyrics by DOROTHY FIELDS Music by SIGMUND ROMBERG
 & DOROTHY FIELDS DOROTHY FIELDS SIGMUND ROMBERG
 BROADWAY THEATRE, Broadway & 53rd Street. Matinees Wed. & Sat.
 REALLY AIR-CONDITIONED

MOTION PICTURES

"A commanding screen biography." . . Crowther, Times.

DARRYL F. ZANUCK'S
WILSON

In Technicolor

Directed by HENRY KING Written for the Screen by LAMAR TROTTI

A 20th Century-Fox Picture

With Alexander Knox . . Charles Coburn . . Geraldine Fitzgerald . . Thomas Mitchell . . Ruth Nelson . . Sir Cedric Hardwicke . . Vincent Price . . William Eythe . . Mary Anderson . . and a huge cast of 12,000.

Opening July 25th

Popular Prices **ROXY** 7th Ave. at 50th Street

NOW RKO

"Very Touching . . . Sentimentally Moving"
 —N. Y. Post.

Dorothy McGUIRE
 Robert YOUNG
 Herbert MARSHALL

THE ENCHANTED COTTAGE

Based on the play by SIR ARTHUR WING PINERO
 — Plus —
 "Brighton Strangler" JOHN LODER JUNE DUPREZ

BROOKLYN & QUEENS
 ALDEN Jamaica
 BUSHWICK
 DYKER
 Kelt's
 FLUSHING
 GREENPOINT
 KENMORE
 MADISON
 ORPHEUM
 PROSPECT
 REPUBLIC
 Kelt's
 RICHMOND HILL
 STRAND
 Far Rockaway
 TILYU

FOR YOUR CONVENIENCE

THE NATION
 20 Vesey Street
 New York 7, N. Y.

Dear Sirs:

I want to subscribe to *The Nation*, or the following *Nation* magazine combinations as listed below:

Money-Saving Magazine Combinations

THE Nation	
with Harpers Magazine	\$6.50
You save \$2.50	
with Consumers Union	\$7.00
You save \$1.50	
with HARPERS & Consumers Union	\$9.00
You save \$3.50	
with Free World	\$7.50
You save \$1.50	
with Saturday Review	\$8.50
You save \$1.50	

All club combinations listed are for one year, and may be mailed to different individuals and addresses. Canadian and foreign postage extra.

THE NATION BY ITSELF

1 Year \$5	2 Years \$8
3 Years \$11	
Servicemen's Rate: \$3 a Year	
Canadian and Foreign Postage, \$1 a Year Extra	

☐ Remittance enclosed ☐ Bill me

NAME.....
 STREET.....
 CITY..... ZONE..... STATE.....

7-2T-45

Films

JAMES
AGEE

SOME of the following movies, which were released during my vacation, should be reviewed in detail. But in order to catch up on them at all, I can provide only a check-list.

"We Accuse," the most powerful and important of them, is the Russian record of war-criminal trials at Kharkov. Its atrocity pictures and the pictures of Russian civilians in the courtroom are convincing and moving enough practically to annihilate any doubts you may have whether the trials were in fact just. The confessions of the accused Germans, on the other hand, seem impossible either to accept or to reject.

"Rhapsody in Blue," a biography of Gershwin, is not by a good deal the picture that might have been made about the man, his music, and the time and place they functioned in. But it is too sympathetic to deserve its generally chilly reception. Robert Alda lacks the obsessiveness, the elegance, and the power to persuade you that he is a man of great ability which would have made him fully adequate as Gershwin; but I think he is nearly as good a Gershwin as Alexander Knox was a Wilson, and any amount better cast than there was any law-of-averages reason to hope for. The invented romances and the elementary dramatization of conflict between highbrow and popular music are misguided, but sincerely, not shamefully, so. There is a great deal of good music. I wish all of it had been used as well as "Bidin' My Time," which turns up casually, late in a crowded party; and that they had given more than a snatch of that fine song.

"The Way Ahead," Carol Reed's most ambitious movie, is the story of the education of eight English infantrymen, from conscription to combat. It is not likely to be very popular with those who think that the English language is spoken correctly only in the several thousand dialects used between Portland Headlight and Point Sur. But it is filled with good characterization, taste, perception, and performance. It is also, for all that, formulaic and conventional rather than very strongly imaginative.

"A Bell for Adano," I gather, is generally held to be weak in comparison with the book and the play, which I don't know. Of itself I thought it very sincere and kindly, especially in John Hodiak's performance as Joppolo, well

photographed and staged in several of its street scenes, unintentionally patronizing in its general portrayal of the Sicilians, and as a whole rather insipid, more like a valentine of good-will than like the living thing.

"Blood on the Sun," and practically everywhere else, tells of James Cagney's dangerously hampered efforts to get the Tanaka Plan out of Japan in time—during Hoover's administration—to warn his countrymen. Except for Cagney's vivid performance little in the film transcends likable athletic melodrama—or tries to; and little falls short of that.

"Murder, He Says," in which Fred MacMurray, a straying investigator for the Trotter Poll, runs foul of Marjorie Main and several other lethal mountaineers, is a broad and possibly terrible farce which I very much enjoyed.

"Pillow to Post," in which, for reasons not worth mentioning, Ida Lupino pretends to be married to an army lieutenant, is a broad and certainly terrible farce which I hardly enjoyed at all.

"Christmas in Connecticut," in which, for reasons still less worth mentioning, Barbara Stanwyck pretends she is married to Reginald Gardiner, is a broad and inconceivably terrible farce. To enjoy almost any moment of it, you have to accept the premise that it is the most natural, charming, and funny thing in the world for people to treat each other abominably.

The short, unbeatably fine war film "San Pietro" became available to theaters several weeks ago, at the time it was reviewed here. I have just learned that it can be seen in New York, for the first time, during the two weeks following July 11, at the 55th Street Playhouse. It will presumably be shown elsewhere if enough people request it of their exhibitors. Otherwise it is not likely to be shown at all.

Records

B. H.
HAGGIN

COLUMBIA also has issued a volume of excerpts from Mussorgsky's "Boris Godunov" (Set 563; \$5.50) recorded by Pinza with the Metropolitan Opera chorus and an orchestra, presumably the Metropolitan's, under the direction of Emil Cooper. The music is again the Rimsky-Korsakov falsification; and the excerpts are for the most part the same as the ones in the Victor volume: the Coronation Scene (two sides),

Boris's *I Have Attained the Highest Power* (one side), his *Ab, I Am Suffocating* (one side), and the Death of Boris (two sides). But Columbia, giving two sides instead of Victor's one to the opening scene, has recorded the scene complete except for Tchelkalov's address; and instead of Varlaam's *In the Town of Kazan* and the Boris-Shuisky dialogue Columbia has recorded Pimen's last narrative (one side and the Polonaise (one side).

The one point of superiority of the Columbia volume is Pinza's singing, which has a variety of dynamics and inflection and a dramatic incisiveness that are lacking in the flood of sonorous, opulent sound produced by Kipnis. Apart from this, if the music often drags in the Victor volume it is often rushed in the Columbia; the choral singing in the Columbia volume hasn't the beautiful tone and sensitive phrasing that are to be heard in the Victor; and the Columbia performances are in Italian whereas the Victor are in Russian. As for recording, Columbia has done an excellent job with Pinza's singing, but has not achieved the superb balance and integration of voice and orchestra that Victor did: in *I Have Attained the Highest Power* the orchestra that is clearly audible all around Kipnis is almost inaudible behind Pinza. Moreover the sound of the orchestra itself, in the Columbia volume, is extremely weak in bass, and without the body, the spaciousness, the richness that it has in the Victor volume; and the chorus is shrieky. And finally Columbia doesn't provide the English translations of the texts of the excerpts that Victor does.

Also on Columbia's July list is a new recording of Debussy's "Nuages" and "Fêtes" made by Ormandy and the Philadelphia Orchestra (Set X-247; \$2.50). With his exaggerated expansions and contractions of sonority and his accelerations and retardations of pace in "Nuages" Ormandy makes impassioned and personal a piece which is intended to be completely impersonal and unimpassioned, concerned as it is with "the immutable aspect of the sky and the slow, solemn motion of the clouds." "Fêtes" is well performed, except that the retardation of the section near the end marked *un peu retenu* is not little but enormous. The recorded sound of the clarinets at the beginning of "Nuages" is dulled, veiled, wooden, as is much of the sound thereafter on the first side; the second side brings a sudden increase in volume and a brightness of an unpleasantly acidulous kind;

RESORTS

Something NEW in a Summer Resort!

BILL'S VEGETARIAN HOUSE

WITH LATEST MODERN CONVENIENCES
where Nature's Food is Served to you according to the latest Nutritional Ideas in a Variety of Tasty Succulent, Nourishing Dishes, Salads and Beverages.

In the Cool Catskills, 2,300 feet above sea-level set in a panorama of woods and mountains.

Only \$35 Per week and up

Write for Reservations to

BILL'S VEGETARIAN HOUSE

P. O. BOX 72 PARKSVILLE, N. Y.

PHONE, LIBERTY 104 F 2

J. FLAMENBAUM, Prop.

50 MI. FROM NEW YORK

MAMANASCO Lake Lodge

Ridgefield, Conn. Phone 829

A resort of distinction fashioned from a country estate. Water sports, hiking trails, tennis. Library, open fireplaces. Congenial atmosphere. Famous cuisine.

Birdland

CENTRAL VALLEY, N. Y.

200-ACRE ESTATE 1,000-FT. ELEVATION

Congenial adult resort. All sports. Golf, fine food. Only 45 miles from N. Y.

Highland Mills 7895. DIANA & ABE BERMAN

HATHAWAY LODGE

Formerly the palatial 592 acre Macy estate in the beautiful "Hills of the Sky." Large, luxurious rooms, most of which have open fireplaces and private porches. Tennis, Handball, Swimming Pool, Horseback Riding, also Golf nearby. Marvelous food. Open all year. Attractive Summer Rates.

For reservations or further information write or call
HATHAWAY LODGE, Haines Falls, N. Y.
Telephone: Tannersville 299

CAMMAQUAM

This Adult Camp...

in sheltered cove near picturesque Gloucester. Salt water swimming, sailing, boating and fishing on premises. Dancing, tennis, trips and all sports. Six hours by train from New York.

Gloucester, Mass.
ABRAHAM RESNICK
Director

Write for booklet and rates

OAKDALE LODGE

AKDALE, CONN.

AN ADULT CAMP

All Sports—Swimming—Private Twin Lakes.
Modern Accommodations.
RATES \$42.50 UP

Write for Booklet. Rosa & Ike Lifschutz

WESTERN VIEW FARM

26th Season

Rate: \$9 a day — \$49 a week

TED OHMER

New Milford Connecticut

Telephone: NEW MILFORD 440

FARMS AND ACREAGE

STONE HOUSE; best modern improvements; brooks; springs; cave; view; good barns; 180 acres; pine and hardwood. In N. Y., 8 miles Lenox; \$12,500. Terms. Berkshire Farm Agency, Chatham, N. Y.

and at the end the effect of the *pp* tremolo of the basses and *ppp* roll of the kettledrum is destroyed by the muddy uproar those instruments make on the record. "Fêtes" is well recorded, except for a brashness in its brilliance, and the shattered and shattering sound of the two trumpets at the beginning.

Then there is Tchaikovsky's charming Suite No. 4, "Mozartiana"—his orchestration of three Mozart pieces for piano and a Liszt piano transcription of a Mozart motet—performed by Rodzinski with the New York Philharmonic-Symphony (Set X-248; \$2.50). Whether Rodzinski made his cuts in the concert performance or only for this recording, they reveal the musical insensitiveness that has been evident in his performances. The concluding movement is a

theme and variations, of which the first seven variations complete themselves with full stops, but the eighth continues and builds up to a sustained major chord on D, which prepares us for the entrance of the solo violin in a little cadenza that introduces Variation 9. Rodzinski completes Variation 5; and the next thing we hear is that chord on D, stated as a beginning of what follows, but actually conveying its relation back to the context—the eighth variation—that has been omitted. And in Variation 10, which develops into the long coda of the movement, he again makes cuts which inflict similar wounds on the continuous tissue. The music is treated with the same insensitiveness by a performance which is tense and violent, and which is faithfully reproduced by the recording.

And finally a volume of music by Villa-Lobos sung by Jennie Tourel with an orchestra conducted by the composer (Set X-249; \$2.50). The pieces are five of the twelve "Serestas" or Brazilian Serenades composed in 1925-26, and one of the six "Miniaturas" composed in 1916-17; and they are simpler and more agreeable, but no more valuable, than the more recent output of the Shostakovich of Brazil. Miss Tourel sings them beautifully; and the recorded sound, though not entirely clean, is good enough.

CONTRIBUTORS

J. ALVAREZ DEL VAYO, editor of *The Nation's* Political War section, was Foreign Minister in the last legally elected government of Spain.

JOHN CORSON is director of research for the *Washington Post*.

GAETANO SALVEMINI was professor of modern history at the University of Florence until 1925, when he was arrested as an opponent of fascism. He is now Lauro de Basis lecturer on the history of Italian civilization at Harvard University.

RAY RUNNION, a reporter for the *Chicago Sun*, is making a special study of the city's housing and transportation problems.

MCALISTER COLEMAN is a journalist with long experience in leftist politics. He is the author of "Men and Coal," a study of the American miner.

JOSEPH BORNSTEIN was for many years managing editor of the *Tagebuch* in Berlin and later became editor-in-chief of the *Pariser-Tageblatt*.

RESORTS

INVITATION TO RELAX

Enjoy the serenity of Plum Point. Gorgeous country-side, outdoor activities, delicious food — and fun. Only 5.5 miles from New York. MAKE RESERVATIONS EARLY

plum point

"Year-Round Vacation Resort"

New Windsor, N.Y. Tel: Newburgh 4270

Tall Pines

High in the Dutchess County hills. 100 acres of beautiful rolling country... land and water sports... a design for leisure. N. Y. Central or Hudson River Day Line to Poughkeepsie.

ATTRACTIVE RATES

PLEASANT VALLEY, DUTCHESS CO., N. Y.
Phones: 2741 or 5511

SHADYBROOK

MAHOPAC, N. Y. Tel. Mahopac 2320

50 miles from N. Y. 140 acres rustic country, secluded, restful, homelike. Unexcelled American cuisine. Sports, Movies. Beautiful walks. \$45.

Mrs. G. Popper

ART EXHIBIT

SCULPTURE by Nicholas Mocharnuk.
Marque Gallery, 16 West 57th Street, New York City.

TYPING WANTED

EXPERT TYPING, manuscripts, miscellaneous, intelligently done at home. No addressing of envelopes. Reasonable rates. Box 1540 c/o The Nation.

Classified Advertisements

62 cents a line (six words)

Minimum — three lines

\$6.16 per inch

THE NATION

20 Vesey Street, New York 7, N. Y.
Barclay 7-1066

INFORMATION FOR SUBSCRIBERS

THE NATION, 20 Vesey St., New York 7, N. Y. Price 15 cents a copy. By subscription—Domestic: One year \$5; Two years \$8; Three years \$11. Additional Postage per year: Foreign, \$1; Canadian, \$1. The Nation is indexed in Readers' Guide to Periodical Literature, Book Review Digest, Index to Labor Articles, Public Affairs Information Service, Dramatic Index. Three weeks' notice and the old address as well as the new are required for change of address.